



**compliance with the directives of this order”** would result in the dismissal of this civil action. *Id.* On May 27, 2009, June 16, 2009, and June 26, 2009, this court granted Gachett extensions to file his response. (Doc. Nos. 15, 17, & 19.) The time allotted Gachett for filing a response in compliance with the directives of this court’s June 26, 2009, order expired on July 13, 2009. As of the present date, Gachett has failed to file a requisite response in opposition to the defendants’ written report. In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that this case should be dismissed.

The court has reviewed the file in this case to determine whether a less drastic measure than dismissal is appropriate. After such review, it is clear that dismissal of this case without prejudice is the proper course of action. Gachett is indigent. Thus, the imposition of monetary or other punitive sanctions against him would be ineffectual. Additionally, Gachett has exhibited a lack of deference for this court and its authority as he has failed to comply with the directives of the orders entered in this case. It is therefore apparent that any additional effort by this court to secure Gachett’s compliance would be unavailing. Consequently, the court concludes that the plaintiff’s abandonment of his claims, his failure to comply with the orders of this court and his failure to properly continue prosecution of this cause of action warrant dismissal of this case.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, it is ORDERED that this case be dismissed without prejudice.

Done this 7th day of August, 2009.

/s/Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE